

On interaction-free measurement

Keiji Matsumoto

National Institute of Informatics

2-1-2 Hitotsubashi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 101-8430

e-mail : keiji@nii.ac.jp

June 15, 2016

Abstract

This manuscript is inspired by the paper [2]. In the paper, they investigate a method to detect existence of an object with arbitrarily small interaction. Below, we sketch their protocol to motivate the present manuscript. The object of their protocol is to detect whether the given blackbox interact with input states or not, with negligible distortion of the blackbox, and high detection probability.

In this paper, we do two things. First, we prove the above mentioned protocol is optimal in a certain setting. The main tool here is adversary method [1], a classical method in query complexity. Second, we present a protocol to detect unitary operations with negligible error and no distortion of the input at all.

1 Introduction

This manuscript is inspired by the paper [2]. In the paper, they investigate a method to detect existence of an object with arbitrarily small interaction. Below, we sketch their protocol to motivate the present manuscript. The object of their protocol is to detect whether the given blackbox interact with input states or not, with negligible distortion of the blackbox, and high detection probability.

They generate a photon, split it into two paths, one of which leads to the given blackbox. After going through it, the beam is mixed again. After repeating the process for many times, the photon is measured to decide whether the blackbox is empty or not. The amplitude for the path going into the blackbox stays arbitrarily small if the blackbox interacts with the photon, thus satisfying almost interaction-free condition. Otherwise, this amplitude grows almost to 1, enabling almost complete detection. If the probability of correct detection is almost 1, and the times of repetition is T , the distortion of the system is $O(1/T)$.

In this paper, we do two things. First, we prove the above mentioned protocol is optimal in a certain setting. The main tool here is adversary method [1], a classical method in query complexity. Second, we present a protocol to detect unitary operations with negligible error and no distortion of the input at all. The differences between the two versions are : (1) whether the operation to be estimated is a unitary operation acting only on the input particle $\mathcal{H}_I$ only, or with certain degree of freedom $\mathcal{H}_B$ of the blackbox.

The first scenario: (1) the given blackbox is an interaction between $\mathcal{H}_I$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$, and (2) the distortion is defined as the change of the reduced density matrix on $\mathcal{H}_B$. With additional assumption that the part of $\mathcal{H}_B$ interacting with $\mathcal{H}_I$ is refreshed for each time, we give the converse statement, insisting that the protocol in [2] is optimal. In the second scenario, (1) the given blackbox is a unitary operation acting only on $\mathcal{H}_I$, and therefore (2) the distortion is defined as the change of reduced density matrix on $\mathcal{H}_I$. This scenario may differ from the initial motivation of "interaction-free" measurement, but obtained result is strong enough to justify the setting: if the number of candidates for the given unknown operation is finite, estimation is possible without any distortion at all, and with arbitrarily small error.

2 The first scenario

Our intention here is to prove optimally of the protocol presented in [2] in a reasonable setting. The main tool here is adversary method [1], a classical method in query complexity.

In this setting, the given black box is a controlled unitary interaction U between $\mathcal{H}_I$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$, ($U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_I \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$) and U is either $U_0 = \mathbf{1}$ or U_1 ($\Theta := \{0, 1\}$). We suppose that the subsystem $\mathcal{H}_{B'}$ of $\mathcal{H}_B$ is interacting with $\mathcal{H}_I$. The state of the subsystem $\mathcal{H}_{B'}$ is refreshed to $|f\rangle$ at every time step. Put differently, $\mathcal{H}_B = \mathcal{H}_{B'}^{\otimes n}$, and the initial state is $|f\rangle^{\otimes n}$, and each time one of $|f\rangle$'s subject to U . Further, $A_\theta := \langle f| U_\theta |f\rangle$ satisfies

$$\|A_1\| < 1. \quad (1)$$

This means that U_1 correlates $\mathcal{H}_C$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$, i.e.,

$$U_1 \neq U_{1,I} \otimes U_{1,B}.$$

Control bit space is described by $\mathcal{H}_C$. Thus, we are given a either $\mathbf{1}_I \otimes \mathbf{1}_B$ or $c - U_1$, both acting on $\mathcal{H}_C \otimes \mathcal{H}_I \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$.

In addition to the given black-box operation, we do information processing operations, state preparation, feedback and so on. The working space necessary for these operations is denoted by $\mathcal{H}_W$. Thus, the whole system is $\mathcal{H}_W \otimes \mathcal{H}_C \otimes \mathcal{H}_I \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. We suppose these information processing operation cannot touch $\mathcal{H}_B$, i.e., it is a unitary operation on $\mathcal{H}_W \otimes \mathcal{H}_C \otimes \mathcal{H}_I$. The operations between $t - 1$ -th and t -th application of $c - U$ is denoted by V_t .

Our concern is to keep $\mathcal{H}_B$ unchanged. So the measure of the distortion is

$$D_t := \left\| |\Phi_{\theta,t}\rangle \langle \Phi_{\theta,t}|_{\mathcal{H}_B} - (|f\rangle \langle f|)^{\otimes t} \right\|_1,$$

where $|\Phi_{\theta,t}\rangle$ is a state of the whole system (including the control bits) at the time step t . After the T -th application of the $c - U_\theta$, we measure the state, but only its $\mathcal{H}_C \otimes \mathcal{H}_W \otimes \mathcal{H}_I$ -part, or equivalently, the measurement cannot touch $\mathcal{H}_B$. Therefore,

$$\|\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B} |\Phi_{0,T}\rangle \langle \Phi_{0,T}| - \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B} |\Phi_{1,T}\rangle \langle \Phi_{1,T}|\|_1 \geq 1 - \varepsilon$$

has to hold for ε with $0 < \varepsilon < 1$.

By the protocol in [2], $D_T = O(1/T)$ is achieved for large T . They do not use $\mathcal{H}_W$, and the measurement does not touch $\mathcal{H}_I$. Even with these restriction, their protocol turns out to be at least as good as any protocols with the additional work space $\mathcal{H}_W$ and a measurement over $\mathcal{H}_C \otimes \mathcal{H}_W \otimes \mathcal{H}_I$. More specifically, any protocol in our framework should satisfy

$$D_T \geq (C+1)^{-2} (1-\varepsilon)^2 \frac{1}{T} = O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right), \quad (2)$$

where

$$C := 6 \left(1 - \|A_1\|^2\right)^{-1/2}.$$

Here, observe by assumption(1), C is finite.

Since $|\Phi_{\theta,t}\rangle$ is not tractable, we introduce

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_t\rangle &:= \langle f^{\otimes t} | \Phi_{\theta,t} \rangle \\ &= \langle f^{\otimes t} | (c - U_\theta) V_t \otimes \mathbf{1}_B \cdots (c - U_\theta) V_2 \otimes \mathbf{1}_B (c - U_\theta) V_1 \otimes \mathbf{1}_B | \varphi \rangle | f^{\otimes t} \rangle \\ &= (c - A_\theta) V_t \cdots (c - A_\theta) V_2 (c - A_\theta) V_1 | \varphi \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

with V_t acting on $\mathcal{H}_C \otimes \mathcal{H}_W \otimes \mathcal{H}_I$, and $A_\theta := \langle f | U_\theta | f \rangle$. Also

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi_t\rangle &:= \langle f^{\otimes t} | \Phi_{0,t} \rangle = V_t \cdots V_2 V_1 | \varphi \rangle, \\ |\psi'_t\rangle &:= V_t | \psi_{t-1} \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

so that $|\psi_t\rangle = c - A_1 | \psi'_t \rangle$.

The distortion D_t is bounded from below as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} D_t &= \left\| |\Phi_{1,t}\rangle \langle \Phi_{1,t}|_{\mathcal{H}_B} - (|f\rangle \langle f|)^{\otimes t} \right\|_1 \\ &\geq 1 - \langle f^{\otimes t} | \left(|\Phi_{1,t}\rangle \langle \Phi_{1,t}|_{\mathcal{H}_B} \right) | f^{\otimes t} \rangle \\ &= 1 - \text{tr} \langle f^{\otimes t} | \Phi_{1,t} \rangle \langle \Phi_{1,t} | f^{\otimes t} \rangle \\ &= 1 - \left\| \langle f^{\otimes t} | \Phi_{1,t} \rangle \right\|^2 \\ &= 1 - \|\psi_t\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B} |\Phi_{0,t}\rangle \langle \Phi_{0,t}| - \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B} |\Phi_{1,t}\rangle \langle \Phi_{1,t}|\|_1 \\
& \leq \|\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B} |\Phi_{0,t}\rangle \langle \Phi_{0,t}| - \langle f^{\otimes t} | \Phi_{1,t}\rangle \langle \Phi_{1,t}| f^{\otimes t}\rangle\|_1 + \|\langle f^{\otimes t} | \Phi_{1,t}\rangle \langle \Phi_{1,t}| f^{\otimes t}\rangle - \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B} |\Phi_{1,t}\rangle \langle \Phi_{1,t}|\|_1 \\
& = \|\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B} |\Phi_{0,t}\rangle \langle \Phi_{0,t}| - \langle f^{\otimes t} | \Phi_{1,t}\rangle \langle \Phi_{1,t}| f^{\otimes t}\rangle\|_1 + 1 - \text{tr} \langle f^{\otimes t} | \Phi_{1,t}\rangle \langle \Phi_{1,t}| f^{\otimes t}\rangle \\
& = \|\varphi_t\rangle \langle \varphi_t| - |\psi_t\rangle \langle \psi_t|\|_1 + 1 - \|\psi_t\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Therefore, the key quantities can be bounded from safer side by tracking $|\psi_t\rangle$ and $|\varphi_t\rangle$.

Below, for each $|\varphi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_C \otimes \mathcal{H}_W \otimes \mathcal{H}_I \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, $|\varphi_1\rangle$ and $|\varphi_2\rangle$ is the part part which is subject to/not subject to U_θ , i.e., if $\{|i\rangle; i=1,2\}$ is the CONS of the $\mathcal{H}_C$ corresponding to the control bit,

$$|\varphi_i\rangle := \langle i | \varphi \rangle \quad (i=1,2),$$

so that

$$c - U_\theta \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1 \\ \varphi_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1 \\ U_\theta \varphi_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\psi_t\|^2 &= \|\psi'_{t,1}\|^2 + \|A_1\|^2 \|\psi'_{t,2}\|^2 \\
&= \|\psi'_t\|^2 - \|\psi'_{t,2}\|^2 + \|A_1\|^2 \|\psi'_{t,2}\|^2 \\
&= \|\psi_{t-1}\|^2 - \|\psi'_{t,2}\|^2 + \|A_1\|^2 \|\psi'_{t,2}\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$(1 - \|A_1\|^2) \|\psi'_{t,2}\|^2 = \|\psi_{t-1}\|^2 - \|\psi_t\|^2. \tag{4}$$

On the other hand, the first term of (3) is bounded from above as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\varphi_t\rangle \langle \varphi_t| - |\psi_t\rangle \langle \psi_t|\|_1 \\
& \leq \|\varphi_t\rangle \langle \varphi_t| - |\psi'_t\rangle \langle \psi'_t|\|_1 + \|\psi'_t\rangle \langle \psi'_t| - |\psi_t\rangle \langle \psi_t|\|_1 \\
& = \left\| V_t (|\varphi_{t-1}\rangle \langle \varphi_{t-1}| - |\psi_{t-1}\rangle \langle \psi_{t-1}|) V_t^\dagger \right\|_1 \\
& + \left\| |\psi'_t\rangle \langle \psi'_t| - (c - A_1) |\psi'_t\rangle \langle \psi'_t| (c - A_1)^\dagger \right\|_1 \\
& = \|\varphi_{t-1}\rangle \langle \varphi_{t-1}| - |\psi_{t-1}\rangle \langle \psi_{t-1}|\|_1 \\
& + \left\| |\psi'_t\rangle \langle \psi'_t| - (c - A_1) |\psi'_t\rangle \langle \psi'_t| (c - A_1)^\dagger \right\|_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe, by $\|A_1\| < 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| |\psi'_t\rangle \langle \psi'_t| - (c - A_1) |\psi'_t\rangle \langle \psi'_t| (c - A_1)^\dagger \right\|_1 \\
&= \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 0 & |\psi'_{t,1}\rangle \langle \psi'_{t,2}| (\mathbf{1} - A_1)^\dagger \\ (\mathbf{1} - A_1) |\psi'_{t,2}\rangle \langle \psi'_{t,1}| & A_1 |\psi'_{t,2}\rangle \langle \psi'_{t,2}| (A_1)^\dagger - |\psi'_{t,1}\rangle \langle \psi'_{t,2}| \end{bmatrix} \right\|_1 \\
&\leq 2 \|\mathbf{1} - A_1\| \|\psi'_{t,1}\| \|\psi'_{t,2}\| + \left(\|A_1\|^2 + 1 \right) \|\psi'_{t,2}\|^2 \\
&\leq 6 \|\psi'_{t,2}\| \\
&\leq C \sqrt{\|\psi_{t-1}\|^2 - \|\psi_t\|^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where we had used (4) to show the last inequality.

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B} |\Phi_{0,T}\rangle \langle \Phi_{0,T}| - \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B} |\Phi_{1,T}\rangle \langle \Phi_{1,T}|\|_1 \\
&\leq \| |\varphi_T\rangle \langle \varphi_T| - |\psi_T\rangle \langle \psi_T| \|_1 + 1 - \|\psi_T\|^2 \\
&\leq C \sum_{t=1}^T \sqrt{\|\psi_{t-1}\|^2 - \|\psi_t\|^2} + 1 - \|\psi_T\|^2 \\
&\leq C \sqrt{T \sum_{t=1}^T (\|\psi_{t-1}\|^2 - \|\psi_t\|^2)} + 1 - \|\psi_T\|^2 \\
&= C \sqrt{T (\|\psi_0\|^2 - \|\psi_T\|^2)} + 1 - \|\psi_T\|^2 \\
&= C \sqrt{(1 - \|\psi_T\|^2) T} + 1 - \|\psi_T\|^2 \\
&\leq C \sqrt{T D_T} + D_T \\
&\leq (C + 1) \sqrt{T D_T}
\end{aligned}$$

After all, to distinguish two operations, we have to have

$$\begin{aligned}
1 - \varepsilon &\leq \|\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B} |\Phi_{0,T}\rangle \langle \Phi_{0,T}| - \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B} |\Phi_{1,T}\rangle \langle \Phi_{1,T}|\|_1 \\
&\leq (C + 1) \sqrt{T D_T},
\end{aligned}$$

that leads to (2).

3 The second scenario

The problem treated in this section is interaction-free detection of unitary operations, where the unitary operation is chosen from the family $\{U_\theta\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ of unitary transforms over $\mathcal{H}_I$ with $k := |\Theta| < \infty$ and $d := \dim \mathcal{H}_I < \infty$. Here, the blackbox U_θ is given in the form of controlled operation,

$$c - U_\theta := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1} & 0 \\ 0 & U_\theta \end{bmatrix},$$

thus making total phase meaningful. Interaction-free means that the reduced state on $\mathcal{H}_I$ is unchanged throughout the process, modulo unitary transforms independent of θ . (Since this part can be canceled if necessary.) The control space is denoted by $\mathcal{H}_C$, which corresponds to which-path information. Without loss of generality, we suppose $U_{\theta_0} = \mathbf{1}$. (If this is not the case, we apply control $U_{\theta_0}^\dagger$ right before the given control operation.)

When U_θ 's are commutative, the standard phase estimation protocol is sufficient to achieve the purpose: One can estimate eigenvalue arbitrary accuracy by inflating the number of qubits (see Chapter 5 of [3] for example).

The general case is reduced to this commutative case. Define, for each unitary operator U ,

$$X_{U,\vec{\lambda}}^k := \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} e^{\sqrt{-1}\lambda_i} |e_{i+k}\rangle \langle e_i|,$$

where '+' in the subscript of e is in the sense of modulo d , $\vec{\lambda} = (\lambda^1, \dots, \lambda^d)$ and $\{|e_i\rangle; i = 0, \dots, d-1\}$ are the phase of eigenvalues and eigenvectors of U .

Observe that the i -th eigenvalue of $(X_{U,\vec{\lambda}}^k)^\dagger U' X_{U,\vec{\lambda}}^k$ is $(i-k)$ -th eigenvalue of U' , if eigenvectors of U' are also $\{|e_i\rangle; i = 0, \dots, d-1\}$. Hence with $\Lambda := (\vec{\lambda}_0, \vec{\lambda}_1, \dots, \vec{\lambda}_{d-1})$ and

$$F_{U,\Lambda}(U') := (X_{U,\vec{\lambda}_{d-1}}^{d-1})^\dagger U' X_{U,\vec{\lambda}_{d-1}}^{d-1} \dots (X_{U,\vec{\lambda}_1}^1)^\dagger U' X_{U,\vec{\lambda}_1}^1 \cdot (X_{U,\vec{\lambda}_0}^0)^\dagger U' X_{U,\vec{\lambda}_0}^0,$$

we have

$$F_{U,\Lambda}(U') = (\det U') \mathbf{1}_T.$$

In particular, $F_{U,\vec{\lambda}}(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}$. Therefore, acting $F_{U,\Lambda}$ on the target space $\mathcal{H}_I$,

$$\mathbf{I}_C \otimes F_{U,\Lambda}(c - U') = F_{U,\Lambda}(\mathbf{1}_T) \oplus F_{U,\Lambda}(U') = (\det U') \mathbf{1}_C \otimes \mathbf{1}_T.$$

Thus, this transform can be implementable by acting X_{U_θ} 's and $Z_{\vec{\lambda}, U_\theta}$'s acting on the target space $\mathcal{H}_I$.

Our basic idea is as follows. Given a black box $c - U$, we transform it to $c - U'$, where

$$U' = F_{U_{\theta_i}, \Lambda_i} \circ \dots \circ F_{U_{\theta_2}, \Lambda_2} \circ F_{U_{\theta_1}, \Lambda_1}(U),$$

with proper choice of $\theta_1, \Lambda_1, \theta_2, \Lambda_2, \dots$. $\theta_1, \Lambda_1, \theta_2, \Lambda_2, \dots$ are chosen so that all the members of the family

$$\left\{ F_{U_{\theta_i}, \Lambda_i} \circ \dots \circ F_{U_{\theta_2}, \Lambda_2} \circ F_{U_{\theta_1}, \Lambda_1}(U_\theta) \right\}_{\theta \in \Theta} \quad (5)$$

are commutative, and exactly one element, let it be U_{θ_*} , is not scalar, *i.e.*, not the constant multiple of the identity. This means that at least one eigenvalue of U_{θ_*} (The latter condition is sufficient to make sure that this family contain at least two distinct operations.)

Then we run the circuit of the phase estimation, and do the projective measurement that judges $\theta \neq \theta_*$ without any error, and $\theta = \theta_*$ with small error, which can be made arbitrarily small. If the estimate is θ_* , we terminate and let θ_* be the final estimate. (In this case $\theta \neq \theta_*$ happens with small probability, but it can be made arbitrarily small.) Otherwise, we apply the process above to the smaller family $\Theta / \{\theta_*\}$. (In this case, the true value of θ is one of $\Theta / \{\theta_*\}$ with certainty.)

For (5) to satisfy the requirements, $\theta_1, \Lambda_1, \theta_2, \Lambda_2, \dots$ are chosen as follows. Pick up U_{θ_1} that is not a constant multiple of $\mathbf{1}$, and let $U_{\theta'}$ be the one which does not commute with U_{θ_1} . (If there is no such θ' , no preprocessing is necessary.) Then we use the following lemma:

Lemma 1 *There is Λ with $F_{U,\Lambda}(U') \neq c\mathbf{1}$ for all U' with $[U, U'] \neq 0$.*

Proof. Suppose the contrary is true, i.e., for any Λ

$$F_{U,\Lambda}(U') = c\Lambda\mathbf{1}.$$

Taking average with respect to $\vec{\lambda}_1, \dots, \vec{\lambda}_{d-1}$ according to the uniform distribution,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_{U, \vec{\lambda}_{d-1}}^{d-1} \right)^\dagger U' X_{U, \vec{\lambda}_{d-1}}^{d-1} \cdots \left(X_{U, \vec{\lambda}_1}^1 \right)^\dagger U' X_{U, \vec{\lambda}_1}^1 \right]$$

is diagonal with respect to the basis $\{|e_i\rangle; i = 0, \dots, d-1\}$. Therefore, by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_{U, \vec{\lambda}_{d-1}}^{d-1} \right)^\dagger U' X_{U, \vec{\lambda}_{d-1}}^{d-1} \cdots \left(X_{U, \vec{\lambda}_1}^1 \right)^\dagger U' X_{U, \vec{\lambda}_1}^1 \right] \cdot \left(X_{U, \vec{\lambda}_0}^0 \right)^\dagger U' X_{U, \vec{\lambda}_0}^0 = \mathbb{E}[c_\Lambda] \mathbf{1},$$

$\left(X_{U, \vec{\lambda}_0}^0 \right)^\dagger U' X_{U, \vec{\lambda}_0}^0$ is diagonal for all $\vec{\lambda}_0$. This can be true only if U' is diagonal, contradicting with the assumption $[U, U'] \neq 0$. Therefore, there is at least one Λ with $F_{U_{\theta_1}, \Lambda}(U_{\theta'}) \neq c\mathbf{1}$. ■

By this lemma, there is Λ_1 such that $F_{U_{\theta_1}, \Lambda_1}(U_{\theta'})$ is not a constant multiple of $\mathbf{1}$. The number of elements not constant multiples of $\mathbf{1}$ in the family $\{F_{U_{\theta_1}, \Lambda_1}(U_\theta)\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ is non-zero, and smaller than the number of such elements in $\{U_\theta\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$. Repeating this process for many times, we obtain (5) that satisfies the requirements.

References

- [1] A. Ambainis, "Quantum lower bounds by quantum arguments," STOC '00 Proceedings of the thirty-second annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing (2000)1
- [2] P. Kwiat, H. Weinfurter, T. Herzog, and A. Zeilinger, "Interactio-free Measurement," Physical Review Letters, Vol. 74, No. 24, pp. 4763-4776 (1994)
- [3] M. Nielsen and M. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2000).